DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 261 UD 015 662

AUTHOR Brown, James M.
TITLE Office of Probation - Richmond College: Reading Center Assessment. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, Staten Island, N.Y. Richmond Coll.
PUB DATE Jul 74
NOTE 41p.; Parts of this document may not be clearly legible on reproduction due to the print quality of the original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Correctional Education; *Delinquent Rehabilitation; Delinquents; Disadvantaged Youth; Junior High School Students; Minority Group Children; Probationary Period; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Rehabilitation Programs; Retarded Readers; Self Concept; Self Esteem; *Underachievers; Urban Youth; Youth Problems; *Youth Programs
IDENTIFIERS New York (Staten Island); *Richmond College Reading Center

ABSTRACT

This program serves a population of disaffected, underachieving inner-city youth of junior high and high school age who are known to the Family and/or Criminal courts and are at least two years retarded in reading. In most cases, the first efforts of the center are said to be directed to the provision of remedial reading services, and toward helping the learner rebuild a positive self image and self confidence and motivation for learning. The evaluation consists of a two-fold process that of assessing the impact and the degree of success of the center as based on the proposed criteria and that of assessing the administrative processes operating within the program. Along with major topics such as description, student population, and program, the evaluation section provides the three major objectives along with their procedure, findings, and interpretation. Among the recommendations made are that formal attitudinal measures be employed to assess the amount and degree of growth for future planning and record keeping purposes; that an initial in-depth case conference for the new learner be attended by all staff assigned to the enrollee; that periodic case conferences be held to ascertain what has or has not been accomplished and to plan and set future goals for the youth, particularly those that are most in need of extensive assistance; and that black and Spanish-speaking tutors be hired. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

UDO 15662

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EVALUATION REPORT

ED117261

OFFICE OF PROBATION-RICHMOND COLLEGE READING CENTER A S S E S S M E N T

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Prepared by

James M. Brown

July 1974

A report of an Office of Probation-Richmond College reading project supported by Federal "Law Enforcement Assistance Administration" funding, performed at the request of Richmond College, Staten Island, New York, for 1973-1974.

UD 015 662

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Office of Probation-Richmond College Reading Center Evaluation Report

		Page
I	DESCRIPTION	1
II	STUDENT POPULATION	2
III	PROGRAM	3
IV	EVALUATION	3
	Objective 1	4
	Procedure	5
	Findings	5
	Interpretation	6
	Objective 2	7
	Procedure	7
	Findings	8
	Interpretation	10
	Objective 3	10
	School Drop-Outs	11
	Questionnaire Responses - Learners	11
	Purpose and Procedure	11
	Findings	12
	Interpretation	13
	Questionnaire Responses - Tutors	18
	Purpose and Procedure	18
	Findings	18
	Interpretation	21
	Community Workers	31
	Procedure	31
	Findings	31
V	RECOMMENDATIONS	33

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table I	Home School Evaluation Sheet	5-6
Table II	Reading Center Gains in Reading	8-10
Table III	Questionnaire Responses - Learners	14-18
Table IV	Questionnaire Responses - Tutors	23-30

OFFICE OF PROBATION-RICHMOND COLLEGE READING CENTER EVALUATION REPORT

DESCRIPTION

The Office of Probation-Richmond College Reading Center is located on two floors at 57 Bay Street, Staten Island, New York, in the center of a commercially-zoned district with a number of small businesses operating in the area. The floors serve as a location for a general office, a resource-conference room, and six small classrooms.

Four desks in the general office creates a crowded situation which is aggravated by the traffic pattern during breaks in programming and at the commencement and at the end of the Center's daily operation. Most staff members and learners enter and leave through this area which contributes to a "grand central station" effect. Also, at any given time, one may find the secretary, administrators, four or five tutors, and two community workers in conversation with or attempting to meet the demands of a half dozen or more of the youth. However, in spite of this confusion, the workers seem poised in all situations.

Four of the classrooms are small areas divided by cubicles or stalls accommodating three or four learners and their tutors in each room. In the additional classrooms, one is furnished with traditional classroom furniture and the other is equipped with two old sofas and a television set and doubles as a lounge area.

The Center opens daily from 3:30 P.M. until 5:30 P.M. and from 6:30 P.M. until 8:30 P.M., Monday through Friday. The latter time period is scheduled for the High School Equivalency group.

STUDENT POPULATION

The youth of the Reading Center could be described generally as disaffected, acting-out, underachieving inner-city youngsters of junior high school and high school age who are known to the Family and/or Criminal Courts and are at least two years retarded in reading. They have a history of truanting, aggression in and out of school, and involvement in delinquent behavior. Over and above, the family and the child must be accepting of the program. However, the program is servicing non-probationary youth.

The major criteria by which rejection from the program was determined as denoted in the proposal was:

1. those children from whom reading services are already being provided by other agencies.
2. those overtly psychotic children already in special classes for the emotionally disturbed.
3. those children with serious neurological defects requiring specialized services.
4. those severely mentally defective children already in special education classes for the defective.

Most of the youth were referred to the Center by the Probation Officer in Intake, Investigation or Supervision or by the Court Liaison, Board of Education, School Representative. All referrals were made in writing and include all pertinent information available on the youth. After an initial interview and further careful screening at the Center, the prospective candidate will be rejected or accepted in the program.

PROGRAM

The regular school program has not met the needs of most youngsters referred to the Reading Center. In most cases, the first efforts of the Center must be, not only to provide remedial reading services, but toward helping the learner rebuild a positive self-image and self-confidence and motivation for learning. The program is, by design, community oriented,,with definite planning for the involvement of parents, for the use of community agencies, and for the engagement of community people as Center staff members. The approach to be utilized is interdisciplinary.

EVALUATION

Before proceeding with a discussion of the evaluation proper, several comments are in order. It would be inaccurate to interpret the sometimes critical statements in this report as condemnations of the Reading Center. On the contrary, the investigator is in accordance with the importance of each of the program elements. Recommendations invariably are directed toward improvement, not necessarily alteration. It has been done to encourage the Center in the business of perfecting its practices.

The evaluation has principally consisted of a two-fold process:

1. To assess the impact and the degree of success of the Office of Probation-Richmond College Reading Center predicated upon the criteria set forth in the proposal.
2. To assess the administrative processes operating within

the program.

More limited objectives of this evaluation study were to make an assessment of the extent to which students valued and identified with the Center and education in general and their self-confidence and attitudinal changes in being part of an alternative learning environment.

The evaluator's work has included visits to the Center for four days during the month of June, at which time, he interviewed the program administratots, tutors, and community workers and observed the operative aspects of the Center. The evaluation has, also, embodied questionnaires administered to the tutors and the learners. In addition, changes in reading levels were assessed by beginning and middle standardized reading achievement test data furnished by the Director of Reading. Visits to the home schools of the youth enrolled in the Center were also conducted, at which time, the evaluator interviewed guidance personnel who responded to evaluation sheets issued to them in order to ascertain their (the youth's) functioning and progress. Those evaluation activities culminated in this report.*

Objectives, measurement criterion, findings, and interpretations are reported as follows.

Objective 1

As a group, the Office of Probation-Richmond College Reading

* Regrettably the investigator was unable, within the constraints of a time limitation, to follow-up the adjustment process of an extensive number of students in their home schools.

Center in-school learners will demonstrate the following:

1. Better daily attendance in their home schools than before entrance into the program.
2. Fewer behavior problems.
3. Improvement in school achievement

Procedure

A behavioral evaluation sheet was distributed to the guidance counselors in the home schools of the Center's learners. Guidance personnel were requested to respond to this questionnaire as it would mirror the behavioral prototypes of the students that were assigned to them in the counseling role since January 1974.

Findings

Based upon a sampling of 18 youth the percentages of improvement as they reflect the stated criteria for success indicate that, as a group, over 75 percent of the youth evidenced no improvement in academic, attendance, acting-out, and attitudinal patterns. Only in the area of reading skills is there reflected a percentage equalization between improvement and lack of improvement. Table I below is a summary of the findings.

Table I

HOME SCHOOL EVALUATION SHEET

Behaviors	Greatly Improved	Improved	The Same	Regressed
In School Attendance	6%	17%	33%	44%

Table I (cont'd)

HOME SCHOOL EVALUATION SHEET

Behaviors	Greatly Improved	Improved	The Same	Regressed
In School Behavior	---	24%	35%	41%
In Reading Skills	19%	25%	19%	37%
In His Interest in Schoolwork	---	24%	41%	35%
In His Attitude Toward School	6%	18%	41%	35%
In His Attitude Toward Peers	6%	18%	41%	35%

N = 18

Interpretation

Although no specific percentage of learner adjustment was designated in the proposal, the evaluator feels that Objective 1 was not attained because of the relatively small percentage of academic and behavioral adjustment on the part of youth in their home schools. However, it must be remembered that some students are simply not motivated to accomplish academic pursuits and behavioral expectations at all times in their respective lives and no amount of educational intervention by a formal institution is likely to change that condition. In some cases, only time and the changes which it brings to more fundamental aspects of human life can really change this aversion to formal learning endeavors. Often education takes place apart from any kind of formal school or work experience. We must not be overly discouraged that some

students do not choose, at a particular time, to accept our academic and behavioral hopes and goals.

Objective 2

Based upon the individual specification of a youth's needs and interests, an appropriate individualized reading program will be developed and administered over a differentially selected period of time. Upon completion of this individualized program, the learners will:

1. improve in reading

   a) in 6 months a minimum of 1 year improvement.

   b) in 1 year a minimum of 2 years improvement.

Procedure

As each of the youth entered the Center, regardless of whether this entry was at the beginning of the year or at a later date in time, he was tested with an appropriate level of the California Reading Test, the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, the Metropolitan Achievement Test, and the Stanford Achievement Test. These tests were to serve as pre-tests for subsequent measures of reading growth. Similarly, in the middle and at the conclusion of the year, each of the youth at the Center was to have been tested with a different form of the tests to assess his progress.

While it was reported that this objective received the greatest attention and its measurement was generally regarded by the staff as the most significant indication of program success, actual middle test data were frequently missing because of the transition of youth in and out of the program.

Findings

The following comparison of beginning and middle Gates-MacGinitie Reading, Metropolitan Achievement, and Stanford Achievement Tests' scores are reported. The time lapse between scores were not, however, the previously stipulated six month period of time but averaged three and one-half months. Here one should take into consideration the number of youngsters on whom data were submitted as compared with the number having received both beginning and middle administrations. End of the year tests had not been conducted at the time of the evaluation.

Table II

READING CENTER
GAINS IN READING

	Metropolitan Intermediate Reading Test	Gates MacGinitie Reading Test	Metropolitan Primary II Rd. Test	Stanford Primary I Rd. Test
Total Number	75	80	5	1
Test Number	9	15	1	1
Average Months Enrolled*	2.77	3.93	5.0	5.0
Beginning Test Grade Equivalent (Vocab.-Wd. Kwldge)				
Average	4.2	4.9	2.4	1.0
Range	2.1 to 6.1	0 to 10.8	---	---

Beginning Test
* Includes only the Test Number

Table II (cont'd)

READING CENTER
GAINS IN READING

	Metropolitan Intermediate Rd. Test	Gates MacGinitie Rd. Test	Metropolitan Primary II Rd. Test	Stanford Primary I Rd. Test
Beginning Test Grade Equivalent (Comp.-Reading)				
Average	4.4	3.4	1.2	---
Range	2.4 to 6.3	0 to 9.6	---	---
Beginning Test Total Grade Equivalent				
Average	3.9	---	1.8	---
Range	2.2 to 5.7	---	---	---
Middle Test Grade Equivalent (Vocab.-Wd. Kwldge)				
Average	4.9	6.0	2.4	1.8
Range	3.5 to 7.1	3.0 to 9.8	---	---
Middle Test Grade Equivalent (Comp.-Reading)				
Average	5.0	4.7	2.4	---
Range	2.4 to 6.3	0 to 12.6+	---	---
Middle Test Total Grade Equivalent				
Average	4.9	---	2.4	---
Range	2.9 to 6.6	---	---	---
Average Gain in Months (Vocab.-Wd. Kwldge)	7	11	0	8

Table II (cont'd)

READING CENTER
GAINS IN READING

	Metropolitan Intermediate Rd. Test	Gates MacGinitie Rd. Test	Metropolitan Primary II Rd. Test	Stanford Primary I Rd. Test
Average Gain in Months (Comp.-Reading)	8	18	12	---
Average Gain in Months (Total)	6	14	6	8

Interpretation

Table II gives a summary of beginning and middle testing and gains in relation to time in vocabulary-word knowledge, comprehension-reading, and total grade equivalents. These are for youth who stuck with it. Those of whom had not been enrolled long enough for a second testing or those who dropped out prior to a second testing were not considered in the analysis. The average number of months gained in vocabulary-word knowledge, comprehension-reading, and total grade equivalent indicate a rate of growth markedly above the average national rate. Comments were made by most of the tutors that the majority of the youth are motivated toward reading and that there has been an increased feeling of self-confidence. Perhaps, these elements contributed, in part, to the dramatically higher middle test scores.

In terms of the stated criteria, Objective 2 was attained by the Office of Probation-Richmond College Reading Center.

Objective 3

The attainment of the objective of a low recidivism rate

among probationary youth was assessed in an evaluation performed by the Office of Probation.

School Drop-Outs

Although in the proposal the Reading Center was designed to service school drop-outs, the investigator made no attempt to assess or to follow-up that group.since the vast majority of youth enrolled in the Center were attending school or of the age whereby under the New York State Compulsory Education Law, they should b e attending an educational institution.

Questionnaire Responses - Learners

Purpose and Procedure

An anonymous questionnaire was administered to 31 learners in the Reading Center. This meant, of course, that there would be no way to cross-check responses for accuracy or for follow-up purposes, but it was felt that the data obtained, while somewhat limited in value, would provide a tentative profile of the learner's background, experience and opinion, as a supplement to information obtained through other means. The design of the questionnaire was far from ideal; some learners did not respond to all questions. Moreover, it isn't known how clearly the questionnaire was understood by all respondents although some were aided by the tutors and how honestly opinions were expressed. With these reservations in mind, however, the following tables are offered as one picture of the youth in the Reading Center.

The respondents had been in the program one to nine

months and averaged 4.34 months (Q. 8). The majority of those responding were also enrolled in the local schools.

Findings

Forty-one percent of those responding indicated that they made a lot of progress in reading and 55 percent report that they made a little progress (Q. 5). Most report that their reading improvement has definitely had a positive effect upon their other schoolwork whereby they are receiving better grades (Q. 6 - 81%). The latter response doesn't parallel information received from the home schools which report a majority of the learners not effecting an adequate adjustment. However, the majority recount (Q. 10 - 65%) that their home school attendance has not improved since attending the Center which corresponds to the report from the home schools (77%).

As given in the summary of overall attitudes, the large majority like the program (Q. 4 - 90%) and none dislike attending the Center. One hundred percent indicated that the program should continue for many reasons which they stated (Q. 19). Although most feel that they have been helped in reading (Q. 12 - 21), only half report that their attitude or behavior has been modified at the Center and in their home schools (Q. 7 - 53%). Furthermore, only 47 percent relate progress toward becoming the person that they want to be. Again, these responses were verified in reports from the home schools.

Although active parental involvement in the Center has been minimal with only 21 percent of the parents having vis-

ited the Center, there appears to be a positive interest and a supportive parental element indicated by the frequency of responses as to what parents have to say about the program (Qs. 17 and 18).

A tabulation of comments made by the learners to open-ended questions stress their liking for the friendly, understanding , open, informal atmosphere of the Center, the honest relationship with tutors and other staff, the freedom of choice in their activities, the activities themselves, the paid experience (carfare and lunch money), and the reduced pressure. They urge the addition of more staff, students, activities, games, subjects, space, reading time, trips, and lunches. Some complain about the need to expel several youth from the program owing to aggressive and acting-out behavior and, consequently, the need to exert more restraints upon disruptive youth. Several suggest that they wish no change in the structure and organization of the Center.

Interpretation

The learners at the Center appear to be expressing a number of goals for the program. They seem to be saying that the Center as they know it is designed as:

1. a place for momentary escape from neighborhoods, streets, and conventional school atmosphere.
2. a place where it is possible to establish close relationships with people.
3. a place that likes and respects youth,,in part, because

it gives them physical freedom, choice, and certain adult liberties.

4. a place that will respect your needs and protect you while you "flounder."
5. a place that grants you more time in which to come to terms with yourself.
6. a place where you can get help in rectifying some of your learning problems.
7. a place which provides a multitude of "fun" activities.

They also indicated a number of problems:

1. The necessity for an increase in staff, students, activities, and time.
2. The need to provide more structure for youth who are a disruptive force to the tranquil operation of the program.
3. The need for additional space.

Table III

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - LEARNERS

1. Number of learners enrolled on the Reading Center who responded to the questionnaire.

   Total 31

2. Total length of time you have been enrolled in the Reading Center.

Average Time	4.34 months
Time Range	1 to 9 months

Table III (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - LEARNERS

3. Do you think the program should continue?

A. Yes	100%
B. No	0%

Why or why not?

People need help.
Keeps me out of trouble.
I like it.
Keeps kids off the street.
It's helpful.
Because it's fun.
So I can keep comming.
I want my reading improved.
Other people need help with reading.
Very educational.
Because more students are going to attend.

4. How do you feel about attending the Center?

A. Enjoy attending	90%
B. Dislike attending	0%
C. Don't know	10%

5. Do you feel that you have improved in reading since attending the Center?

A. Lost ground	0%
B. Made a little progress	55%
C. Stood still (no progress)	4%
D. Made a lot of progress	41%

6. Are you making better grades in your home school since attending the Center?

A. Yes	81%
B. No	19%

7. Has your attitude or behavior changed here and at your home school since attending the Center?

A. Yes	53%
B. No	47%

In what way?

Table III (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - LEARNERS

I'm not so bad.
Don't curse.
I like school.
I learned how to get along with others.
I respect and get along with others.
I speak better and know more words.
Before I hated to read, now I don't.

88. Are you satisfied with the things you are doing here at the Center and outside?

A. No, definitely not satisfied	3%
B. A little satisfied	29%
C. Satisfied	26%
D. More than satisfied	3%
E. Very satisfied	39%

9. Has your attendance at the home school improved since attending the Center?

A. Yes	35%
B. No	65%

10. How well have you progressed toward becoming the person that you want to be?

A. Lost ground	0%
B. Stood still (no progress)	13%
C. Made a little progress	40%
D. Made a lot of progress	47%

11. Are thettutors at the Center different than the teachers at your home school?

A. Yes	93%
B. No	7%

<u>If yes, in what way</u>?

They bear with you more.
The teachers are fun.
They are more patient.
Much freer here.
Take up more time with you.
Know where you need the most help.
Don't have you stuck up in class for 45 minutes.

Table III (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - LEARNERS

Younger!
They are nicer.
In school teachers don't let me talk or read a book.

12. Have any of you parents visited the Center?

A. Yes	21%
B. No	79%

13. Outside of your tutor, with whom do you generally discuss your reading problems and needs?	Frequency
Nobody.	6
My mother.	3
Tom. (Assistant Director)	3
The guidance counselor.	3
Teacher.	2
Ray (Community Worker)	2

14. What are some of things you like about this program?	
The games.	8
Readigg	6
The carfare and the lunch money.	3
The tutors.	3
Sometimes the reading.	2
The people.	2
The tutors are interested in you learning what they are teaching you.	1
The way they teach, even if you don't learn the first time, they will keep on teaching you.	1
Keeps you out of trouble and helps you.	1
The things we do.	1
The trips.	1
We have fun.	1

15. How can the program be improved?	
Get rid of some of the students who fight, carry on, and bother everybody so everybody can do his work, Get more students that are interested in the program.	4
More playing, activities, and games.	3
More tutors.	3
I like it the way it is.	3

Table III (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - LEARNERS

	Frequency
Lunches.	2
More time for reading.	1
Bigger place and more trips.	1
More subjects.	1
Don't know.	1

16. What do you think of your tutors? Why?

Generous, nice, understanding, like working with them.	8
All right.	5
OK	5
Good to me.	3
Takes time to help me when I need it	2
They are OK because they aren't like those in school.	1
Let's me do what I like to do.	1
I hate some tutors and like some.	1
Interested in me and in teaching me the best way.	1
Treats you with respect.	1
I get along with everyone, never a problem.	1
Talks with us and helps us in reading a lot.	1
Always think they're bigger and smarter.	1

17. What do your parents have to say about the program?

Thinks it is alright, nice, and likes it.	7
Says it is a good idea and good program.	5
Nothing.	3
It will keep me from going into the streets.	2
She is happy I came.	1
mother says I will learn a lot and it will make a woman out of me.	1

18. What were your reasons for coming to the Center ?

To improve my reading.	15
My probation officer sent me.	4
To get my Equivalency Diploma,	3
Friend told me it was a nice place to come to and you can do things.	2
Because I wanted to.	1
There is nothing else to do around the block.	1

19. How have the tutors helped you most?

In my reading.	21

Table III (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - LEARNERS

With my math	Frequency
With my math.	5
My attitude.	1
Helped me from getting in trouble on the streets.	1
I don't know.	1

Questionnaire Responses - Tutors

Purpose and Procedure

In order to elicit their views of the Reading Center, an anonymous attitudinal questionnaire was developed and given to 15 tutors. All 15 tutors at the Reading Center responded to the questionnaire.

The questionnaire essentially requested feed-back in four distinct areas:

1. Learner-tutor relationships.
2. Administrative, supervisory, and organizational elements.
3. Programmatic matters.
4. Instructional considerations and modes.

Table IV presents the percentages, the frequency of response, and the comments in each item category. Note that the average length of time that these members of staff have been engaged by the Reading Center has been 7 months with the longest service there being 9 months and the shortest time 4 months (0. 1).

Findings

The tutors were unanimous in reporting that most of the youth enjoy attending the Center (Q. 12) and that they have established significant relationships with the learners assigned to them (Q. 10). Nonetheless, a significant number of tutors suggested that they were hindered in establishing relationships with their assigned learners since they were of a different ethnic group (Q. 11). Most of the tutors have gone beyond the realm of Center involvement, only, and have interacted with youth in extra-curricular activities and capacities in order to further extent meaningful relationships (Q. 17 - 86%). Significantly, a comparison of the percentage of responses and frequency of comments between learner and tutor as to their (the learners) enjoyment in attending the program and the reasons why they like attending, indicate a similar pattern exists in the responses and the comments of both (Q. 12 and Qs. 4 and 14 - Learner's Questionnaire). That is, both respondents perceive those categories in a positive manner.

Eighty-six percent of the instructional staff specified learner progress in the following areas: reading, self-confidence, thinking skills, socialization, self-worth, and attitudinal and behavioral development (Q. 14). However, there were concerns about their inability to motivate or inspire every learner (Q. 13).

Although 73 percent of the tutors are in support of and dedicated to the program and its objectives and the accomplishment of these objectives (Q. 20), they did indicate

several serious problems.

In spontaneous comments and answers to open-ended questions, many tutors fervently stressed that one on the greatest weaknesses in the program is the lack of adequate space to conduct essential programmatic functions (Q. 18 - 86% and Q. 22). Answers as to additional facilities needed accented space for individual study and a quiet or isolated work area, a designated area for a student lounge and a separate room for recreational activities (Q. 18). Other notable inadequacies emphasized are the lack of communication, cooperation, cohesiveness and divergence and/or consistency of philosophy among the program administrators as it affects tutorial staff, the lack of program structure, the lack of control of inappropriate behavior on the part of youth, and the lack of supplementary instructional staff to service an overabundance of youth (Q. 22).

Recommendations of tutors for improvement of the program largely reflect the expressions of programmatic weaknesses (Q. 23).

In respect to the strengths of the program, 100 percent of the tutors reported that through working with students individually in an informal atmosphere, they are able to facilitate improvement in learners in their confidence, self-esteem, relationships with adults, and reading progress (Q. 21). Furthermore, they like the program flexibility and the freedom to arrange their individual instructional programs (Q. 21 - 64%). The multiplicity of materials to draw from,

the cooperation and attitude among staff (principally tutorial staff), and the cooperation and attitude of the learners were viewed as major strengths of the program (Q. 21). Note that 21 percent of the tutoring staff reported close tutorial supervision as an inherent programmatic strength (Q. 21) and 87% percent indicated that they are being adequately supervised, however, a significant number commented that they were being overly or perfunctorily supervised (Q. 9).

Most of the tutors reported that the reading and the interdisciplinary course were essential to their effective functioning in the tutorial process and understanding and establishing relationships with the youth in the program (Q. 2 - 80% and Q. 5 - 67%). Notwithstanding, 33 percent felt that the reading course was not significantly helpful to utilize with their learners and 100 percent maintained that they had to modify the techniques and suggestions provided in the course to meet the needs and interests of their individual learners.

Interpretation

The basic problem encountered at the Center has been that of effective communication between and among all elements of the program. In a program notable for the degree of communication and interaction between students and staff, there is conspicuous lack of meaningful communication and interaction between the program administrators and other staff. Although most of the tutors and community workers designated remedia-

tion in reading as the primary objective of the program along with concomitant objectives in the modification of the social and personality structures of the youth, there appears to be no clear delineation of the relative importance of each of these in the operation of the program. In fact, tutors and community workers perceive a conflict between administrators concerning the focus and direction of the program. Moreover, a number of staff members feel that their ideas are listened to and considered but aren't often implemented.

This problem has created an inordinate amount of underlying tensions which, to achieve a balance among the tensions, would require administrative creativity. That balance has not been achieved.

There needs to be a concerted effort to confront this lack of communication. One preliminary technique would be to set up a schedule of formal weekly meetings whereby the administrators of the program would meet with tutorial and community staff to address staff problems and development.

For the most part, tutors have made changes in their previously learned instructional techniques. They feel these changes have been responsive to the individual needs of the youth. They are also quite optimistic that the Center can accomplish all or most of its objectives. As indicated, they feel that individual instruction is the greatest strength of the Center and that most of the learners have made progress in reading, in social adaptation, and in positive personali-

ty modifications.

Most of the staff identified the physical facilities of the program as being inadequate for efficient and effective program operation. Indeed, this is comprehensible since this issue can be the foundation for tensions among the participants. Consider, however, that stress need not, indeed should not, be restricted to a single causal relationship such as density of space utilization. It is at least disputable that the human factors in a social system are perhaps more significant.

The answer to stress, then, appears to be "it depends." It depends on the sensitivity and creativity of the staff who plan and help create the program and organization. Rigidity, conformity, and dullness are frequent companions of stress, as is size in terms of its interrelationshipswith these. Where the human organization is designed and performing in ways conducive to participation, to variety of learning styles and rhythms, and to individual growth and development this need not take place. The absolutely essential element is a sensitive and responsive staff of administrators, community workers, and tutors.

Table IV

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - TUTORS

1. Total length of time tutoring at the Center.

Average Time	7 months
Time Range	4 to 9 months

Table IV (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - TUTORS

2. Has the course in diagnostic and reading techniques been helpful in your instructional processes?

A. Yes	80%
B. No	7%
C. Undecided	13%

If not or undecided, why not?

Not much on reading techniques was discussed that could be applied to level of my students although tutors' prsentations gave me new ideas.
The course was helpful in the beginning but as it progressed, we did less meaningful activities.
Only in the beginning.

3. Have you followed closely the diagnostic techniques and instructional suggestions outlined in the reading course?

A. Yes	60%
B. No	33%
C. Sometimes	7%

4. If not, why not?

With each learner, there is a different way to approach their problems.
To a certain extent. I have used my techniques and materials to meet needs
Little that could be used with my students was discussed.
I have used these techniques as a guideline, and adapted them to meet individual needs.
They have not been appropriate for my students.

4. Have you made any modifications in your tutoring techniques?

A. Yes	100%
B. No	0%

If yes, please specify.

I became more flexible in dealing with the moods of learners. (3 responses)
Had to introduce more unstructured activities (3 responses)

Table IV (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - TUTORS

It was necessary to adapt techniques to each particular student. (2 responses)
Picked up ideas from other tutors.
If a student is averse to suggested material, I won't use it.

5. Has the interdisciplinary course been helpful in providing insights for you in developing relationships with the young people you are tutoring?

A. Yes	67%
B. No	20%
C. Undecided	13%

6. Do you feel that many youth in the Center may have an individual need for structure or guidance.

A. Yes	87%
B. No	0%
C. Undecided	13%

7. Do you feel that as a tutor, you should provide more structure for the youth?

A. Yes	50%
B. No	36%
C. Undecided	14%

8. If you feel that more structure is needed, have you been adequately aided in providing this structure?

A. Yes	45%
B. No	45%
C. Sometimes	10%

9. Do you feel that you have been adequately supervised in the tutoring process?

A. Yes	87%
B. No	13%

Any comments?

Overly supervised.
Much supervision is on a superficial level.
Superabundance of supervision in areas of preparation, yet more attention could have been paid to offering alternative suggestions and materials for specific problematic individuals.

At times more adequately than I feel necessary.

10. Do you feel that you have established meaningful relationships with the young people who have been assigned to you?

A. Yes	100%
B. Mes	0%
B. Undecided	0%

11. Does the fact that you are from a different ethnic group hinder or make more difficult the establishment of relationships with the learners?

A. Yes	20%
B. No	73%
C. Sometimes	7%

12. Do you feel that most youth enjoy attending the Center?

A. Yes	100%
B. No	0%

Why?

As a hang-out and to socialize.(6 responses)
Friendly atmosphere, can feel at ease. (3 responses)
People who care about them. (3 responses)
They continue to come. (3 responses)
They like establishing relationships with tutors.(2 responses)
Learning to read.(2 responses)
They are getting money.
They need a place to come to and feel wanted and important.
Play constructive games.
Gives them something to do off the streets.
The Center is free and open, yet they feel they are learning.

13. Are most of the young people motivated toward their reading activities after an initial period of acclimation to the Center?

A. Yes	60%
B. No	20%
C. Sometimes	20%

14. Have you observed progress and development (don't confine yourself to reading achievement, alone,

Table IV (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - TUTORS

but include) in the youth you are tutoring?

A. Yes	80%
B. No	7%
C. Undecided	7%

If yes, what type?

Progress in reading.(8 responses)
Able to socialize. (5 responses)
Little more confidence in themselves. (4 responses)
Diminishing arrests.(2 resonses)
Positive behavioral changes. (2 responses)
Overly aggressive kids become less aggressive and quiet kids open up.(2 responses)
Learners moods are mercurial, hard to judge progress.
Feeling of importance and worth.
Attitude toward learning has changed.
Thinking skills.
Trust and friendliness and feeling we care.

15. Have you often organized learners into groups for instructional purposes?

A. Yes	60%
B. No	40%

16. Have you been encouraged by your supervisors to follow-up any of the young people beyond the tutoring situation?

A. Yes	47%
B. No	53%

17. Have you made yourself available to learners outside the Center?

A. Yes	86%
B. No	14%

If yes, in what ways?

Taken them to Off-Broadway plays and plays at the College. (3 responses)
To a movie.
Played ball with me.

Table IV (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - TUTORS

Walk home together.
They have invited me and I have gone to school basketball games.
Taken them to the Richmond College cafeteria.
Taken them to the College video services and computers.
Helped them with personal problems and taken them where they needed to go.

18. Are the present physical facilities adequate?

A. Yes 14%

B. No 86%

If no, what improvement in physical facilities do you deem necessary?

More quiet space and designated area for a lounge.
Separate room for recreational activities.
More private spaces and a social room (permanent audio and video equipment).
More room for group instruction and individual tutoring.
A quiet area to work. It is distracting to have people come in and out of room when you are trying to work.

19. Do you feel that your instructional ideas have been listened to and considered by your supervisors?

A. Yes 79%

B. No 21%

20. Do you feel that the program can accomplish all of its objectives?

A. Yes 73%
B. No 7%
C. Undecided 20%

Any comments?

Need reinforcement from outside agencies.
Can accomplish objectives for most students, not all.
Anything is possible.
The program has already helped kids cope.
In a limited fashion.
I don't know whether reading scores have been raised.

Table IV (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - TUTORS

I don't know if the program alone can help some youth overcome negative forces from the home environment. Program can work very well but lack of space is an obstacle, students are easily distracted by one another.

21. What do you feel are the major strengths of the program?

A.	Individual instruction	100%
B.	Program flexibility	64%
C.	Individual instructional freedom	64%
D.	Multitude of materials	57%
E.	Cooperation and attitude among staff	57%
F.	Cooperation and attitude of the youth	35%
G.	Close tutorial supervision	21%
H.	Atmosphere different	7%
I.	Parental support	7%
J.	Extensive planning	7%

22. What do you feel are the greatest weaknesses of the program?	Frequency
The lack of communication and cooperation, hypocrisy, and conflict of ideas and philosophies among the directors. This disparity in the ranks of the directors has created an apathy among tutorial staff and a lack of direction.	19
The lack of space.	5
Lack of additional tutors.	3
Lack of control of student behavior.	3
Lack of structure (formal lesson plans).	1
Use of the Center as a "hang-out."	1
Limitation to the amount of kids being tutored.	1
Lack of consistent attendance by the youth	1

23. What recommendations can you give for improvement?

Organization and continuity in objecives among directors. Regular staff meetings to air out complaints.	5
More space	4

Table IV (cont'd)

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES - TUTORS

	Frequency
Community workers and Probation Officers should intercede in controlling poor behavior and organize the kids.	3
More unstructured learning and creative projects.	2
More tutors.	2
Sanctions on non-attendance by the youth.	1
Less supervision over the tutors.	1

24. What do you feel are the major objectives of the programs?

To improve reading.	14
To improve socialization and to help change the attitude of the youth--behavior and academic.	12
To give positive influence to kids and to channel their energies toward positive goals.	6
To keep kids off the streets.	5
To make students realize someone cares	3
To promote creative projects and provide recreational activities.	3
To help them acquire more self-confidence	2
To motivate students to read on their own.	2
To make learning fun.	1
To reduce recidivism.	1
To enable youth to see success and progress.	1

25. Number of learners serviced by tutors since being employed by the Center.

Average	4.5 learners
Range	1 to 8 learners

Community Workers

Procedure

Since there are only 2 community workers engaged by the Reading Center, interviews with them became the prime source of information.

In assessing the community workers' responsibilities as depicted in the proposal, they include:

1. sending out notices on broken appointments.
2. making home visits to verify reasons for broken appointments, social and environmental data, etc.
3. helping to supervise the Center on a rotating basis at least every third day per week.
4. being available to accompany youth and/or family members to schools, clinics, employment offices, etc. Thus acting as advocate, escort, helper and being available as a liaison for any public or private agency.
5. having a case load of 35 youth in terms of their involvement in the Center and more intensive involvement with providing service to about 15 or 20 of these.

Predicated upon these responsibilities and knowledge acquired about the performance of youth in the program, this investigator has attempted to appraise the actions of community workers in these roles.

Findings

Previously stated information concerning the adjustment

of Center youth in their home schools specified a sameness or regression in adjustment by the plurality of youth. Obviously, the Center can't assume full responsibility for the conversion of youth back into the "mainstream." The home and other agencies must also be accountable. However, community workers have been endowed with the responsibility of contacting service agencies and families and following up youth who are enrolled in the Center. Upon questioning the community workers, they asserted that they have made very few home visits and no visits to the home schools. Specifically, the proposal indicated that a large percentage of their time (at least three days per week) should be spent outside of the Center. Ostensibly, this time should have been expended in the aforementioned pursuits. A reasonable degree of success in facilitating effective adjustment by youth to the home, Center, and school must stress close cooperation and communication among all involved in the process.

These responses were confirmed by the guidance counselors in 5 out of 6 schools. Apparently, only initial contacts were made but no follow-up. In fact, one school communication read:

> "There has been no communication from the Center regarding the progress of those students I recommended. Parents have complained to me that there is little, if any, communication between the Center and the home; that there is a lack of concern about the absenteeism."

Another problem cited during the evaluation was the ir-

regularity in attendance and the turnover of youth at the Center. In this respect, the community workers reported that communications were not forwarded to the homes to elicit the reasons for absenteeism nor was absenteeism followed up in terms of home visits. Although it was a stated function of community workers, it was not executed and could have contributed to the rapid turnover of youth in the program. Again, the restriction of community workers largely to duties in the Center perpetuates the problem.

Finally, community workers are reticent about whether the Center can accomplish all or most of its objectives. The evaluator feels this stems from, not only the lack of unity among Center staff, but also from inhibiting their role of continuous contact and follow-up.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Even though attitudinal changes in the learners have been informally observed by the Center staff, formal attitudinal measures should be employed to assess the amount and degree of growth for future planning and record-keeping purposes.
2. After an initial introductory and basic reading course (for new tutors), it should take the form of sharing and utilizing techniques, devices, materials, and books that have been successfully adapted and employed for the differential needs and levels of students. Methods and materials which, after trial, were found inappropriate

should be discontinued and not made part of the course. This would necessitate tutorial staff coming together with the Director of Reading to revise the course presentations.

3. Although the proposal states that 100 youth should be active in the Center at any one time and that 150 youth should be serviced during the year, care must be taken that the Center doesn't become enveloped in maintaining numbers and that the depth of servicing remain the number one priority. This entails:

    a) an initial in-depth case conference for the new learner attended by all staff assigned to the enrollee.

    b) periodic case conferences to ascertain what has or has not been accomplished and to plan and set future goals for the youth, particularly, those that are most in need of extensive assistance.

4. As part of the orientation process for new enrollees, it is advisable to have a group discussion focusing on the purpose and nature of the total program. If an enrollee has an understanding of the environment, he can more intelligently choose his role in it.

5. Orientation and enrollment procedures should be held monthly. More frequent incorporation of enrollees into an ongoing program tends to disrupt the rapport developing between already enrolled learners and staff. Research tends to support this procedure.

6. The addition of a third community worker (allocated in the proposal) to lighten the case load of the two currently on staff in order to permit intense and concentrated servicing. In addition, the attendant community workers should spend the time stipulated by the proposal in the field to maintain contact and communication with families, agencies, and institutions.
7. The establishment of areas of communication among all staff members in the program in order to centralize efforts, bring them together, and share common problems. It is recommended that an in-house person skilled in group work and social interventions or an outside consultant be engaged for this purpose. This assistance would take the form of:
    a) group building.
    b) helping with identified problem areas.
    c) assisting Administration around leadership styles.
8. Administrative staff must unite to establish a consistent pattern of direction toward the goals specified in the proposal.
9. Since the entire tutorial staff is white and the students are predominantly black or Spanish-speaking, a significant percentage of the tutors viewed this as an inhibiting factor in the formulation of relationships due to the wide gap in cultural background. It is recommended that every effort be made to engage black and Spanish-speaking tutors.

10. In surveying the personal reading folders of learners, a daily record of progress was not always recorded. It is essential that an written evaluation be made by the tutor at the end of each session. Moreover, the goal of each instructional unit should be as clear as possible to the learner and his progress toward it should be consistently evaluated by him and the tutor.